

## GENERAL REMARKS

### Claim 1

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) on the basis of it being anticipated by Okamoto (U.S. Pat. No. 6,572,660 B1, granted 6/3/03, filed 8/18/99, provisional filed 8/20/98). Applicants request reconsideration of this rejection for the following reason: Okamoto's invention, drag and link, clearly differs in structure from claim 1 since it requires exactly two user-inputs before it can be executed, whereas claim 1 recites only one. Okamoto's two user inputs are called a "source visual-element" (SVE) and a "hypertext visual-element" (HVE). Okamoto creates a new link to a new context containing the SVE in step 318 (FIG. 15C), but not until after the SVE and HVE have both been specified by the user in steps 100 (FIG.15A) and 304 (FIG. 15C).<sup>3</sup> Applicants' sole required user input, called "marked text" (MT), is equivalent to Okamoto's SVE, and is all that is necessary for a functional hyperlink to be created according to the method of claim 1. Applicants submit that this reduced number of required user inputs is itself a novel physical feature which

---

<sup>3</sup>Steps 100, 304, and 318 are as follows:

"The drag and link process begins with step 100 in FIG. 15A where the user selects a source-visual element 20 (FIG. 2)" (col 9, lines 31-32).

"[When] the pointer is positioned over the target-visual element...[and] the Shift key is down (SKD)...the process defines the hyperlink-visual element and visually accentuates the HVE to indicate it is the hyperlink target, step 304" (col 10, lines 32-37).

"If the source object is a component within an existing document rather than a document, step 318, the process automatically creates a new document, moves the selected source object to this new document, removes the source object and its associated source-visual element, creates a hyperlink connecting the hyperlink-visual element to the newly created document, sets the document label to a representation of the hyperlink-visual element, and changes the pointer shape to a hyperlink hand" (col 11, lines 3-12).

clearly distinguishes the claimed invention over Okamoto, and thus, serves to overcome any rejection based on §102(e).

Applicants further submit that the structural differences which characterize the claimed invention as a whole are not obvious under §103, for the following reasons:

1. Claim 1 omits one element from the prior art without loss of capability. As argued above, claim 1 requires only one input, MT, whereas drag and link requires two, SVE and HVE. The method of claim 1 suffers no loss of capability as the blank underline that immediately appears in place of the MT is a fully functional hyperlink and will lead to the child context when selected, whether or not the user later decides to insert any linked text.
2. Okamoto's SVE must be directly manipulated before a link can be created, while applicants' corresponding element, MT, requires no further direct manipulation at all.<sup>4</sup>
3. Okamoto states that his intention is to provide a method "for easily creating hyperlinks and hyperlinked documents...that is vastly simpler than the cumbersome process implemented by prior art systems" (col 1, lines 56-60). However, applicants simplify the number of steps required by the prior art in a way that is unmatched by Okamoto, even by his own criteria. Users skilled in the art will recognize that when the five step process<sup>5</sup> ascribed by Okamoto to the prior art is cast in his own flowchart language,

---

<sup>4</sup>Okamoto's SVE must be directly manipulated by 1) dragging it to a TVE; 2) pressing the shift key when the SVE is over the TVE to indicate the start of the HVE; 3) dragging the SVE, with the shift key still pressed down, to the end of the TVE to indicate the end of the HVE; and finally, by 4) dropping the SVE to actually execute the drag and link function.

<sup>5</sup>The prior art, according to Okamoto, consists of five steps (col 1, lines 27-40):

"[T]o create a hyperlink within a current document using a typical prior art system, a user is required to 1) first create a new document that will serve as the destination of the hyperlink; 2) in the current document, highlight a string of text specifying the location of the hyperlink; 3) select a menu or toolbar command that displays a file [sic.] selection dialog box; 4) enter the new document as the destination of the hyperlink in the dialog box; 5) press a button in

the prior art consists of 19 flowchart steps, in comparison to Okamoto's 12 for drag and link. In contrast, claim 1 would amount to only 3 of Okamoto's flowchart steps.

4. Okamoto's approach is based on lifting the familiar aspects of the conventional drag and drop operation to the domain of hyperlinking.<sup>6</sup> The essential structural features of the conventional drag and drop operation which drag and link faithfully emulates are never questioned by him.<sup>7</sup> In contrast, the method of claim 1 enables the creation of a functional hyperlink to a new context without recourse to the conventional drag and drop operation. Applicants submit that Okamoto thus teaches away from the method of claim 1.

---

the dialog box that closes the dialog box and saves the new document as the destination of the hyperlink."

<sup>6</sup>He expressly states at least seven times that his invention involves using the familiar method of the conventional drag and drop operation. (See sentence two of Okamoto's abstract: "A user can effortlessly create hyperlinks and hyperlinked documents...by simply pressing a predetermined key while dragging and dropping source-visual elements...onto target-visual elements..." See sentence three of his abstract: "The method and system is defined herein as a "drag and link" operation, enabling the user to create hyperlinks and hyperlinked documents from the direct manipulation of information with the familiar ease of the conventional drag and drop operation." See (col 1, lines 47-56): Okamoto restates sentences 2 and 3 of his abstract; see (col 2, lines 40-45): Okamoto restates sentence 2 of his abstract; see (col 2, lines 45-50): sentence 3 of his abstract is restated. See (col 3, lines 66 to col 4, line 5: "The preferred embodiment of the present invention, known as the drag and link operation, exploits the familiar ease of the well-known conventional drag and drop operation. Users skilled in the art will recognize the similarities between the drag and link operation and appreciate how these similarities contribute to the ease of use of the present invention." See (col 11, lines 58-64): "[T]he user can select, drag, and drop a source-visual element associated with a source object onto a specific location within a target-visual element associated with a target object, automatically creating a new document containing the source object and automatically creating a hyperlink connecting the target object and the new document.")

<sup>7</sup>Okamoto states the following implicit limitation on the scope of his invention:

"Those skilled in the art will appreciate the applicability of the present invention [drag and link] to any visual element that can be directly manipulated such as any element that can be the target or source of a conventional drag and drop operation" (col 8, lines 54-58).

5. There is nothing in Okamoto to suggest that drag and link can, or should, be modified to reduce the number of prespecified user inputs from two to one, before linking is enabled.
6. Even if it was suggested, reducing the number of required inputs from two to one would render drag and link inoperable and unfit for its intended purpose, unless extensive modifications were made. For unlike bud, drag and link cannot function if given only one user-determined element. Once Okamoto's SVE 20 (FIG. 2) is selected in step 100 (FIG. 15A) and designated as the first user input, the user must proceed to drag it onto an already existing target visual-element 22 (FIG. 2) in step 208 (FIG. 15B), and go through at least four more steps (steps 302, 304, 308, 310 FIG. 15C) before a hyperlink can be created in step 312 (FIG. 15C). If the target element does not yet exist, the user must create one; but then doing so cancels<sup>8</sup> the selection of the SVE 20, made in step 100.

Therefore applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1, for all of the reasons given above. Applicants also request that if claim 1 is again rejected in view of Okamoto, that the Examiner please provide an explanation, i.e., a factual basis to support how Okamoto (or indeed, any other reference) could have anticipated, or made claim 1 obvious, at the time the claimed invention was made.

## Claims 2, 4, 55, and 56

In the previous section, applicants discussed the novel and nonobvious features of their system to argue that Okamoto does not truly anticipate claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102, nor does he render claim 1 obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103. Dependent claims 2, 4, 55, and 56

---

<sup>8</sup>Okamoto states,

"In accordance with conventional mouse deselection techniques, if the primary mouse button 12 (FIG.1) is depressed when the pointer 66 is not over any part of the selected source-visual element 70, the selection is canceled" (col 4, lines 21-25).

incorporate all the subject matter of claim 1 and add additional subject matter which makes them a fortiori and independently patentable over Okamoto. Applicants therefore request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 2 and 4, and furthermore request consideration of the new claims 55 and 56 on similar grounds.

### Claim 3

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of Hennings, et. al. (US Pat. No. 6,763,496 B1, granted 7/13/04, filed 3/31/99). The OA acknowledged that,

“Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Okamoto does not explicitly disclose that said name comprises a uniquely identifying function of a timestamp at which said new context creation occurs.”

However, it went on to assert that,

“Hennings discloses the hyperlink linking to a linked document where there is a [sic.] contextual information including the date and time when the document to be linked is last modified (col 14, lines 26-46, figure 7A: information associated to the hyperlink Cruises showing the date and time when the cruises.htm document is last modified)” (OA, point 8, p. 5).

Applicants request reconsideration of this rejection for the following reason: Although Hennings does show a timestamp in association with a link 112 (FIG. 7A), with said timestamp representing “the date and time at which the linked document was last modified” (col 12, lines 64-65), Hennings neither uses, nor suggests using, the timestamp to *name* the linked document, as claim 3 recites.

Consider FIG.’s 3A and 3B which show the HTML file- and URL-structure of his example Internet web site. Each linked document is presented as already having a file name (such as “index.htm”) and ready to use in his example (col 10, lines 35-42). Hennings does

not address how any of the linked documents in his web site got their names, except to say that they were already created by FRONTPAGE(TM), a web page authoring program. Note that none of the names shown in either figure are an actual timestamp, and no names are disclosed as having been determined by a function of the timestamp.

In fact, Hennings is limited to using the timestamp in a strictly conventional manner, i.e., to label the time that a document was last modified. For Hennings, the title of a linked document and the time at which it was last modified are stored as two separate "meta-data entries" in a "contextual information file" that is associated with each linked document. See his "example of a contextual information file" 166 that "corresponds to Cruises page 118 of the travel agency web site example of FIG. 2, [shown also in FIG. 7A]..." (col 12, lines 26-67). The contextual information file 166 contains 23 distinct meta-data entries, each on its own line of code. For example, line 11 is as follows:

```
11. vti_title:SR|Cruises page
```

This encodes the title, i.e., "Cruises," of the linked page with which contextual information file 166 is associated. Line 5 is as follows:

```
5. vti_timelastmodified:TR|02 Feb 1999 20:22:53-0000
```

It encodes the time at which the linked document was last modified. The values of the `title` and `timelastmodified` meta-data entries are independent and distinct from one another. He never suggests collapsing the distinction between any two meta-data entries by using the value of one to determine the value of the other.

Accordingly, applicants submit that dependent claim 3 incorporates all the subject matter of claim 1, and adds additional subject matter which makes it a fortiori and independently patentable over Hennings and Okamoto, or any combination thereof. Applicants therefore request that if claim 3 is again rejected based on Okamoto in view of Hennings (or indeed, of any other reference), that the Examiner please provide an explanation, i.e., a factual basis to support the conclusion that, given the prior art, it would have been obvious to do what the applicants did in claim 3.

## Claim 12

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of Hennings. It has been amended to define patentably over these references, and any combination thereof. Applicants request reconsideration of this rejection for the following reason: Dependent claim 12 incorporates all the subject matter of independent claim 1, and adds additional subject matter which makes it a fortiori and independently patentable over Okamoto and Hennings, and any combination thereof.

## Claim 19

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of Microsoft Word 2000. The OA (p. 16) acknowledged that,

“Okamoto does not disclose recording said user-inserted text in a history list when said editing is provided.”

However, it went on to state that,

“Word discloses a well-known feature of the Edit function...that stored [sic.] all the words inserted by a user to an existing text so that if the user wants to delete some text, [sic.] then wants to restore the deleted text, Word will render [sic.] original text inserted by the user. This implies that the user-inserted text is recorded in a history list so that the text entered by a user, after being deleted, can be restored as requested.”

Applicants request reconsideration of this rejection for the following reason: The applicants’ purpose in recording the linked text is not to easily restore inserted or deleted text, but to provide a timestamped record (i.e., a log) of the linked text associated with a hyperlink whenever that hyperlink is used. Neither Okamoto nor Word 2000 suggests keeping specific track of changes made to linked text. Claim 19 has been amended to make these differences clearer.

Applicants submit that dependent claim 19 incorporates all the subject matter of claim 1, and adds additional subject matter which makes it a fortiori and independently patentable over Okamoto and Word 2000, or any combination thereof. Applicants also request that if claim 19 is again rejected, that the Examiner please provide an explanation, i.e., a factual basis to support how these references (or indeed, any other) could have anticipated, or made claim 19 obvious, at the time the claimed invention was made.

## Claim 21

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Okamoto. The OA (p. 4) stated that,

“Regarding claim 21, which is dependent on claim 1, Okamoto discloses creating an icon representing said new context when said user-selected content is dragged from a parent editing means (figures 6, 7, 8A-D, 9: the little rectangle in the pointer 66 is considered as an icon representing the new context ‘Favorite Quotes’ when the user-selected content ‘History...heroin’ is dragged from the editing means in the parent sticky where said editing means is considered equivalent to the parent editing means).”

Applicants request reconsideration of this rejection for the following reason: The reference does not teach what the OA relies upon it as teaching. The “little rectangle in the pointer 66” cited by the OA and shown in FIG.’s 6, 7, and 8A-D, is not an icon representing a new context, but is merely the “new shape of the pointer 66 after the user activates the first predetermined signal” of drag and link. The new shape of pointer 66 is that “of a slanted arrow coming out of a dash-lined square” (col 4, lines 31-33).<sup>9</sup> This new shape of

---

<sup>9</sup>Okamoto states,

“The drag and link operation continues in FIG. 6 which shows the new shape of pointer 66 after the user indicates a first predetermined signal, defined herein by depressing the primary mouse button 12 (FIG. 1), while the pointer 66 is positioned over the selected source-visual element 70....[T]he pointer takes the shape of a slanted arrow coming out of a dash-lined square



pointer 66 simply serves as visual feedback to signal the user that the second predetermined signal of drag and link can be given next. Note that there is no new context which could be represented as an icon until after the third predetermined signal of drag and link has been given (col 7, lines 14-21). Put in terms of steps, the appearance of the “slanted arrow coming out of a dash-lined square” in FIG. 6 corresponds to step 206 (FIG. 15B), which precedes the creation of a new context by at least 6 steps.<sup>10</sup> Similarly, FIG. 9 shows a new hand shape representing the pointer 66, and not the newly created child context as asserted by the OA.<sup>11</sup>

Furthermore, claim 21 has been amended to more particularly and distinctly define the invention over the prior art. Applicants submit that dependent claim 21 incorporates all the subject matter of claim 1, and adds additional subject matter which makes it a fortiori and independently patentable over Okamoto. Applicants also request that if claim 21 is again rejected based on Okamoto, that the Examiner provide an explanation, i.e., a factual basis to support how Okamoto (or indeed any other reference) could have made the features being claimed obvious, at the time the invention was made.

## Claims 24-28 and 30

Claims 24-28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of LaStrange. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections for the

---

when the primary mouse button 12 is depressed while the pointer 66 is positioned over the selected source-visual element 70” (col 4, lines 26-35).

<sup>10</sup>There are still the steps 208, 216/300, 302, 304, 308, and 310 that must occur before a new context is created in step 312.

<sup>11</sup>Okamoto states,

“The pointer 66 changes to the hyperlink hand shape [in FIG. 9] to indicate that the hyperlink may be resolved when the user subsequently depresses the primary mouse button 12 while the pointer 66 is over the hyperlink-visual element 74 containing the newly created hyperlink” (col 7, lines 27-31).

following reason: The references do not teach what the OA relies upon them as teaching. Applicants address each of the claims 24-28 and 30 in the context of the following three points:

1. Regarding LaStrange, the OA referred several times to the existence of a means whereby a user can edit a web page using the “function EDIT” shown in FIG.’s 2-5. However, applicants submit that the EDIT item shown is merely the standard menu item with the options “Cut, Copy, Paste, Clear, Select All, Find..., Find Again, [and] Preferences.” In a conventional browser, all items except for “Find...” and “Preferences” are typically disabled. Note that even if any were enabled, none would be designed to create a new version of the linked page to be displayed. Furthermore, it is well known that a conventional browser only displays a web page and does not allow it be modified,<sup>12</sup> much less versioned. Thus, LaStrange neither discloses modifying a child context, nor “creating and saving a new version of” it, as was asserted by the OA (p. 19).
2. Although Okamoto, unlike LaStrange, does disclose an editing means for a single version of a child context, he does not teach any means by which multiple versions can be made. Users skilled in the art will recognize that when a file is modified and saved under its original filename, the file is overwritten and its previously saved state is destroyed, leaving always a single version. For Okamoto, a single version of any child context is all that exists at any given time, and the possibility or desirability of creating a plurality of versions from which one may be chosen is not considered.
3. The OA made several references to a “version...of [a] child context” being depicted in FIG.’s 4 and 5, however the first and only time that Okamoto shows a child context is in FIG. 13. FIG.’s 4 and 5 show the very earliest stages of the drag and link operation

---

<sup>12</sup>Hennings, for example, states the following in his description of the prior art: “HTML documents are generally static, that is, their contents do not change over time unless modified...using programs such as Microsoft Corporation’s FRONTPAGE(TM) web page development program, which are specifically designed for that purpose” (col 2, lines 9-14).

in which SVE 70 is merely a text selection. It is not a child context, much less a version of one. Okamoto does not create a child context until step 318 (FIG. 15C), and FIG. 5 only depicts up to step 102 (FIG. 15A). FIG. 5 therefore precedes the creation of a child context by at least twelve steps.<sup>13</sup>

**Claim 24** was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of La Strange et. al. (US Pat No. 5,933,142, granted 8/3/99, filed 2/27/98, priority 5/28/96). The rejection of claim 24 on p. 19 of the OA acknowledged that:

“...Okamoto does not disclose creating and saving a new version of said child context comprising said contents,”

but, went on to assert that:

“LaStrange discloses creating and saving a new version of said child context comprising said contents (figure 5, col 4, lines 29-37; and also col 1, line 65 to col 2, line 13: when a user activates hyperlink 54 “LINK TO PAGE 2” contained within the first web page, a second browser window 60 will display the content of the second page; the fact that browser 60 has the function EDIT inherently shows that the second page which is the child context, can be edited to make a new version of the second page, and [sic.] FILE function inherently shows that once the second page is edited, the page will be saved using the SAVE AS option under the FILE which was well known in the art)” [emphasis in the original].

By point 1 above, applicants request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 24, and also request that if it is again rejected based on LaStrange (or any other reference), that the Examiner please provide factual evidence in support of this decision.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>The twelve intervening steps between 102 and 318 are 110, 112, 114/200, 202, 206, 208, 216/300, 302, 304, 308, 310, and 314 (FIG.'s 15A-C).

<sup>14</sup>The MPEP states the following:

“It is never appropriate to rely solely on ‘common knowledge’ in the art without evidentiary

**Claim 25** was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto. The OA stated on page 20,

“Regarding claim 25, which is dependent on claim 24, Okamoto discloses that said selected version is a most recent version of said child context (figures 4-5: since the selected version of text in [sic.] 70 in figure 5 is the same as the text 64 in the original text 60 in figure 4, the selected version in 70 is the most recent version of said child context.)”

By points 2 and 3 above, applicants request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 25. Applicants submit that this claim incorporates all the subject matter of claim 24 and adds additional subject matter which makes it a fortiori and independently patentable over Okamoto. Finally, applicants also request that if claim 25 is again rejected in view of Okamoto (or indeed, of any other reference), that the Examiner please provide an explanation, i.e., a factual basis to support the conclusion that, given the prior art, it would have been obvious to do what the applicants have done.

**Claim 26** was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto. The OA stated,

“Regarding claim 26, which is dependent on claim 24, Okamoto discloses support in the record, as the principal evidence upon which a rejection was based. *Zurko*, 258 F.3d at 1385, 59 USPQ2d at 1697 (“[T]he Board cannot simply reach conclusions based on its own understanding or experience – or on its assessment of what would be basic knowledge or common sense. Rather, the Board must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of these findings.’).” (See §2144.03 A. of the MPEP, pp. 2100-137 to 2100-138.)

And also,

“The tendency to resort to ‘hindsight’ based upon applicant’s disclosure is often difficult to avoid due to the very nature of the examination process. However, impermissible hindsight must be avoided and the legal conclusion must be reached on the basis of the facts gleaned from the prior art....and not based on applicant’s disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)” (See MPEP §2142, p. 2100-128, bold emphasis added).

that the selected version is selected by said user (figures 4-5).” (p. 20)

By points 2 and 3 above, applicants request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 26. Applicants submit that this claim incorporates all the subject matter of claim 24 and adds additional subject matter which makes it a fortiori and independently patentable over Okamoto. Finally, applicants also request that if claim 26 is again rejected in view of Okamoto, that the Examiner please provide an explanation, i.e., to support how Okamoto (or indeed any other reference) could have made the features being claimed obvious, at the time the invention was made.

**Claim 27** was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaStrange. Claim 27 has been amended to more particularly and distinctly define the invention over this reference. By point 1 above, applicants request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 27. Applicants submit that this claim incorporates all the subject matter of claim 24 and adds additional subject matter which makes it a fortiori and independently patentable over LaStrange. Finally, applicants also request that if claim 27 is again rejected in view of LaStrange, that the Examiner please provide an explanation, i.e., a factual basis to support how LaStrange (or indeed any other reference) could have rendered this claim obvious at the time the invention was made.

**Claim 28** was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Okamoto. However, applicants request reconsideration of this rejection because this claim incorporates all the subject of claim 24 and adds additional subject matter which makes claim 28 a fortiori and independently patentable over Okamoto.

**Claim 30** was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Okamoto in view of LaStrange. The OA acknowledged the following (p. 21):

“Regarding claim 30, which is dependent on claim 24, Okamoto does not disclose providing editing means for said user to edit said contents in viewer.”

However, it went on to also assert that

“LaStrange discloses providing editing means for said user to edit said content in viewer (figure 5: [sic.] function EDIT is for providing editing means to said user to edit said content in said viewer). [sic.]”

By point 1 above, applicants request reconsideration of the rejection to claim 30, and submit that claim 30 incorporates all the subject matter of claim 24 and adds additional subject matter which makes it a fortiori and independently patentable over LaStrange. Finally, applicants request that if this claim is again rejected, that the Examiner please provide an explanation, i.e., a factual basis to support how LaStrange (or indeed any other reference) rendered this claim obvious at the time the invention was made.

## **Claim 29**

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto and LaStrange as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Hennings et al. The OA acknowledged that,

“Regarding claim 29, which is dependent on claim 24, Okamoto and LaStrange do not disclose that the version of said child context are named by uniquely identifying functions of timestamps at which said version are created.”

However, it went on to state that

“Hennings discloses the hyperlink linking to a linked document where there is a contextual information including the date and time when said linked document is last modified (col 14, lines 26-46, figure 7A: information associated to the hyperlink Cruises showing the date and time when the cruises.htm document is last modified).” (p. 22)

Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 29 for the following two reasons: Firstly, as argued in the applicants’ response to the rejection of claim 3 on page 11,

although Hennings does show a timestamp in association with a link, with said timestamp representing “the date and time at which the linked document was last modified” (col 12, lines 64-65), he neither uses, nor suggests using, the timestamp to automatically *name*, or furthermore rename, linked documents, as claim 29 recites. Secondly, by analogy of point 2 on page 16, Hennings like Okamoto, does not pertain to a plurality of versions of a linked document.

Therefore, applicants request reconsideration of this claim and submit that it incorporates all the subject matter of claim 24 and adds additional subject matter which makes it a fortiori and independently patentable over Okamoto, LaStrange and Hennings, and any combination thereof. Finally, applicants request that if this claim is again rejected, that the Examiner please provide an explanation, i.e., a factual basis to support how the cited references (or indeed any other reference) rendered this claim obvious at the time the invention was made.

## **Conclusion**

For all the above reasons, applicants submit that the specification and claims are in proper form, and that all claims define patentably over the prior art. Therefore, they submit that this application is in condition for allowance, which action they respectfully solicit.

### Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance

Applicants have amended the specification and claims of this application so that they define novel structure which is also unobvious over the recited prior art. If this application is, for any reason, considered not to be in full condition for allowance, applicants respectfully request the constructive assistance and suggestion of the Examiner pursuant to MPEP §706.03(d) and §706.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for future proceedings.

Very respectfully,

 Saša Buvač  
Applicants Pro Se  Jeaneah Paik

Jeaneah Paik  
in c/o William C. Paik  
14836 Satanas Street  
San Diego, CA 92129

**Certificate Of Mailing:** I hereby certify that on the date below, this document and any referenced attachments, if any, will be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: "COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1450."

February 9, 2005



Jeaneah Paik, Applicant